UAF Application Scoring Rubric

Guideline	1, Deficient	2, Below Average	3, Average	4, Above Average	5, Excellent
Quality of argument in project summary.	Argument is missing, incomplete, and/or illogical. Lack of thoughtfulness and/or care. Reader is left guessing.	Argument is not deficient, but there are a number of concerns regarding clarity, articulation, logic, and thoughtfulness. The reader is left needing more information.	Argument is average in quality. Small issues in logic/clarity, but the argument is mostly complete. The reader is left satisfied.	Argument is shy of 'excellent' standing based on a few small flaws in logic/clarity/ease of reading. Little to nothing is left out.	High quality, persuasive argument clearly articulated, easy to follow, logical, well thought out. Leaves nothing out.
Articulation of student/club/group's role in the faculty, including purpose, history, achievements to date, and short and long term goals.	Role is missing, incomplete, and/or illogical. Lack of thoughtfulness. Reader is left guessing.	Role is not deficient, but there are a number of concerns regarding clarity, articulation, logic, and thoughtfulness. The reader is left needing more information.	Role is average in quality. Small issues in logic/clarity, but the introduction is mostly complete. The reader is left satisfied.	Role is shy of 'excellent' standing based on a few small flaws in logic/clarity/ease of reading. Little to nothing is left out.	High quality of role- clearly articulated, easy to follow, well thought out. Thorough. Leaves nothing out.
Impact of project on student learning. (How many students are involved directly and indirectly? How engaged are students in learning?)	Project has minimal, if any, impact on student learning or student engagement. Reader is left guessing about impact on learning.	Project impact on student learning is minimal-few students will benefit from this experience and students may not be engaged.	Project impact on student learning is average- some students will benefit, students may or may not be engaged in learning.	Project impact on student learning is shy of 'excellent' standing—a moderate proportion of students will benefit, although mostly indirectly. Students are engaged.	Project impact on student learning is extremely high. A large proportion of students will benefit both directly and indirectly, students are highly engaged.
Influence of project on EOAS Department's reputation on a local, national, or international level.	Project has no impact on EOAS Department's reputation on any level. In fact, this project may detract from the EOAS Department's reputation.	Project has minimal impact on the EOAS Department's reputation; there is little interest within the EOAS community.	Project could be of interest to the community, but most interest is based within the EOAS community itself.	Project is of interest to the outside community, but is not media worthy.	Project will showcase EOAS Department to a large number of community members locally, nationally, and internationally. An exciting project could be featured in the media.
Quality of application form (including adherence to application format, spelling, grammar).	Application submitted does not follow format instructions, low level of writing skills employed, including spelling, sentence structure, and grammar.	Application may or may not follow format instructions, many mistakes are found in relation to spelling, sentence structure, and grammar.	Application is average. There are a number of issues regarding format and written communication, but the application is complete.	Format instructions are, for the most part, followed. An above average level of written communications skills is used- a few small mistakes are noted.	Format instructions followed, high level of written communication skills, including spelling, grammar, & sentence structure used.
Thoroughness and clarity of budget. *Note: If budget is missing, OR the amount applied for violates Section V.2.7 in the guidelines, application will not be considered for funding.*	Budget is incomplete and/or illogical. Numbers do not add up- math mistakes are made. Allocation of monies is unreasonable. Numbers are not accounted for. Reader is left guessing about budget.	Budget is subpar. A number of errors are found-either numbers do not add up or are not accounted for. Allocation of monies may be unreasonable. Reader is left needing more information.	Budget is average- a handful of errors are made. Allocation of monies is reasonable. Budget appears complete, but may not include other sources of income.	Budget is just shy of 'excellent' –it is complete, but there are one or two small errors made (that could include math, allocation, justifications, missing other sources of income.)	Budget formatting is clear. Numbers balance out-there are no math mistakes. Allocation of monies is reasonable. When required, justifications are made to describe spending. Other sources of income are showcased.